1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Center for Disability Access Chris Carson, Esq., SBN 280048 Dennis Price, Esq., SBN 279082 Amanda Seabock, Esq., SBN 289900 Mail: PO Box 262490 San Diego, CA 92196-2490 Delivery: 9845 Erma Road, Suite 300 San Diego, CA 92131 (858) 375-7385; (888) 422-5191 fax phylg@potterhandy.com Attorneys for Plaintiff	
8		
9		
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
11	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
12	Oulond Critro	CasaNa
13	Orland Sylve,	Case No.
14	Plaintiff,	Complaint For Damages And
15	V.	Complaint For Damages And Injunctive Relief For Violations Of: American's With Disabilities
1617	ROIC California LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability Company; and Does 1-10,	Act; Unruh Civil Rights Act
18	Defendants.	
19		
20	Plaintiff Orland Sylve complains of ROIC California LLC, a Delaware	
21	Limited Liability Company; and Does 1-10 ("Defendants"), and alleges as	
22	follows:	
23		
24		
25	PARTIES:	
26	1. Plaintiff is a California resident with physical disabilities. He is a	
27	quadriplegic who cannot walk and who uses a wheelchair for mobility.	
28	2. Defendant ROIC California LLC owned the real property located at or	
20	about 243 W. Jackson Street, Hayward, California, in December 2018.	

about 243 W. Jackson Street, Hayward, California, currently.

3. Defendant ROIC California LLC owns the real property located at or

4. Plaintiff does not know the true names of Defendants, their business

capacities, their ownership connection to the property and business, or their

relative responsibilities in causing the access violations herein complained of,

and alleges a joint venture and common enterprise by all such Defendants.

Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the Defendants herein,

including Does 1 through 10, inclusive, is responsible in some capacity for the

events herein alleged, or is a necessary party for obtaining appropriate relief.

Plaintiff will seek leave to amend when the true names, capacities,

connections, and responsibilities of the Defendants and Does 1 through 10,

5. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the action pursuant to 28

6. Pursuant to supplemental jurisdiction, an attendant and related cause

of action, arising from the same nucleus of operative facts and arising out of

the same transactions, is also brought under California's Unruh Civil Rights

7. Venue is proper in this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and is

founded on the fact that the real property which is the subject of this action is

located in this district and that Plaintiff's cause of action arose in this district.

Act, which act expressly incorporates the Americans with Disabilities Act.

U.S.C. § 1331 and § 1343(a)(3) & (a)(4) for violations of the Americans with

3

9

7

1011

12

1314

inclusive, are ascertained.

JURISDICTION & VENUE:

Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. § 12101, et seq.

15 16

17

1819

2021

22

2324

25

26

27

28

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS:

8. Plaintiff went to the property to visit the CVS store in December 2018 with the intention to avail himself of its goods or services, motivated in part to

1

- 4
- 5
- 6 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17 18
- 19
- 20 21
- 22 23
- 24
- 25 26
- 27
- 28

- 9. CVS is a facility open to the public, a place of public accommodation, and a business establishment.
- 10. Parking spaces are one of the facilities, privileges, and advantages offered by Defendants to patrons of CVS.
- 11. Unfortunately, even though there were parking spaces marked and reserved for persons with disabilities in the parking lot serving CVS during Plaintiff's visit, the parking stalls and access aisles located directly in front of CVS were not level with each other because there were slopes that exceeded 2.1%.
- 12. Currently, the parking stalls and access aisles serving CVS are not level with each other.
- 13. Defendants have failed to maintain in operable working condition those features of facilities and equipment that are required to be readily accessible to and usable by persons with disabilities at the Subject Property.
 - 14. Plaintiff personally encountered these barriers.
- 15. This inaccessible facility denied the plaintiff full and equal access and caused him difficulty.
- 16. The defendants have failed to maintain in working and useable conditions those features required to provide ready access to persons with disabilities.
- 17. The barriers identified above are easily removed without much difficulty or expense. They are the types of barriers identified by the Department of Justice as presumably readily achievable to remove and, in fact, these barriers are readily achievable to remove. Moreover, there are numerous alternative accommodations that could be made to provide a greater level of access if complete removal were not achievable.
 - 18. For example, there are numerous paint/stripe companies that will come

and stripe level parking stall and access aisle and install proper signage on rapid notice, with very modest expense, sometimes as low as \$300 in full compliance with federal and state access standards.

- 19. Plaintiff will return to the CVS to avail himself of its goods or services and to determine compliance with the disability access laws. He is currently deterred from doing so because of his knowledge of the existing barriers. If the barriers are not removed, the plaintiff will face unlawful and discriminatory barriers again.
- 20. Given the obvious and blatant nature of the violations and barriers alleged herein, the plaintiff alleges, on information and belief, that there are other violations and barriers on the site that relate to his disability. Plaintiff will amend the Complaint to provide proper notice regarding the scope of this lawsuit once he conducts a site inspection. However, please be on notice that the plaintiff seeks to have all barriers related to his disability remedied. See *Doran v. 7-11*, 524 F.3d 1034 (9th Cir. 2008) (holding that once a plaintiff encounters one barrier at a site, he can sue to have all barriers that relate to his disability removed regardless of whether he personally encountered them).
- I. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990 (On behalf of Plaintiff and against all
- Defendants.) (42 U.S.C. section 12101, et seq.)
- 21. Plaintiff re-pleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this complaint.
- 22. Under the ADA, it is an act of discrimination to fail to ensure that the privileges, advantages, accommodations, facilities, goods and services of any place of public accommodation is offered on a full and equal basis by anyone who owns, leases, or operates a place of public accommodation. See 42 U.S.C.

§ 12182(a). Discrimination is defined, inter alia, as follows:

- a. A failure to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices, or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations to individuals with disabilities, unless the accommodation would work a fundamental alteration of those services and facilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(ii).
- b. A failure to remove architectural barriers where such removal is readily achievable. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv). Barriers are defined by reference to the ADAAG, found at 28 C.F.R., Part 36, Appendix "D."
- c. A failure to make alterations in such a manner that, to the maximum extent feasible, the altered portions of the facility are readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities, including individuals who use wheelchairs or to ensure that, to the maximum extent feasible, the path of travel to the altered area and the bathrooms, telephones, and drinking fountains serving the altered area, are readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(2).
- 23. Under the 2010 Standards, access aisles shall be at the same level as the parking spaces they serve. Changes in level are not permitted. 2010 Standards 502.4. "Access aisle are required to be nearly level in all directions to provide a surface for wheelchair transfer to and from vehicles." 2010 Standards § 502.4 Advisory. No more than a 1:48 slope is permitted. 2010 Standards § 502.4.
 - 24. Here, the failure to provide level parking is a violation of the law.
- 25. The Safe Harbor provisions of the 2010 Standards are not applicable here because the conditions challenged in this lawsuit do not comply with the

1991 Standards.

- 26. A public accommodation must maintain in operable working condition those features of its facilities and equipment that are required to be readily accessible to and usable by persons with disabilities. 28 C.F.R. § 36.211(a).
- 27. Here, the failure to ensure that the accessible facilities were available and ready to be used by the plaintiff is a violation of the law.

II. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE UNRUH CIVIL

- **RIGHTS ACT** (On behalf of Plaintiff and against all Defendants.) (Cal. Civ. Code § 51-53.)
- 28. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this complaint. The Unruh Civil Rights Act ("Unruh Act") guarantees, inter alia, that persons with disabilities are entitled to full and equal accommodations, advantages, facilities, privileges, or services in all business establishment of every kind whatsoever within the jurisdiction of the State of California. Cal. Civ. Code §51(b).
- 29. The Unruh Act provides that a violation of the ADA is a violation of the Unruh Act. Cal. Civ. Code, § 51(f).
- 30. Defendants' acts and omissions, as herein alleged, have violated the Unruh Act by, inter alia, denying, or aiding, or inciting the denial of, Plaintiff's rights to full and equal use of the accommodations, advantages, facilities, privileges, or services offered.
- 31. Because the violation of the Unruh Civil Rights Act resulted in difficulty, discomfort or embarrassment for the plaintiff, the defendants are also each responsible for statutory damages, i.e., a civil penalty. (Civ. Code § 55.56(a)-(c).)

PRAYER: Wherefore, Plaintiff prays that this Court award damages and provide relief as follows: 1. For injunctive relief, compelling Defendants to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Unruh Civil Rights Act. Note: the plaintiff is not invoking section 55 of the California Civil Code and is not seeking injunctive relief under the Disabled Persons Act at all. 2. Damages under the Unruh Civil Rights Act, which provides for actual damages and a statutory minimum of \$4,000. 3. Reasonable attorney fees, litigation expenses and costs of suit, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12205; and Cal. Civ. Code §§ 52. Dated: January 11, 2019 **CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS** By: Chris Carson, Esq. Attorney for plaintiff